This is an experimental, personal note of things in which, can be seen as more later development of DDE (Divine Dialectical Emanationism). More focuses on System Theory and Psychoanalysis rather than Religious metaphysics.

When all reason to stand against injustice is gone, and all form of compliance is rewarded instead, with what language would we use to fight for justice at all?

If goodness is impossible, then it is upon an impossible will that men should stand for justice; a madness or some sort, reaching an impossible ideal for whatever reason. Precisely because they are impossible, the struggle for them is never ending.

It is then can be concluded that, the history of all hitherto struggles of the oppressed is always an Impossible gesture towards justice demanded by unreasonable suffering. Never had been in history of the oppressed that they had struggled because Justice is graspable, or that they ever had any voice in textbook of history; but because the impossible justice is out there, there are impossible suffering that is uncontainable from any language, that justice must be enacted. Across history, in both philosophy and religion, no consensus has ever succeeded in systematizing the ideal of justice. And yet—despite the absence of a clear definition—the struggle precedes all systems. It comes before discipline, beyond accounting. It is a raw, embedded response to suffering that takes root in the subject. Even without knowing what justice is, we know what injustice feels like—because we know what it is to suffer without reason. If justice or any ideals is impossible, then it is upon impossibility itself that the journey of knowledge and striving itself should be based upon. It was never about winning; it has always been about striving.

Noischism

On Binary Towards Absurdity
psycho-analysis of cybernetic through luhmannian system via Lacan.

suppose that environment exists as a superposition of noises, in which, like wave-particle duality, a quanta is both a negative and positive until it were translated. also in this case, quantum tunneling suggests that if you were to change a particle in one place, no matter how far you are, the other particle would respond with opposite conclusion, after both of them collapses from their superposition. but what exactly is a binary? in my interpretation, a binary is a reduction of superposition into legible form that a system may able to process or reacted unto. In this case, each system is a logic gate that transform the potentiality into actuality in costs of reduction or alienation from one potential among all others. But this duality is an illusion, as in, it is not to be or not to be, but to be, is not to be. An alienation is what made the system possible in the first place. in this case, the negativity of a system is also what causes the system to evolve or define itself. it's not binary of 1 or 0, but it might be the case that 1=0. a value is defined by its negation by the logic system itself to remains coherent. that is because as in Luhmannian system, a system cannot directly access reality itself, but must be translated in its own terms through self-referential process of autopoiesis. In this case, a system which they operate, that is, binary logic, is a logic gate that collapses potentiality into actuality. but let's see if we can collapse it back into superposition; in this case, the re-structuring of a system to access reality make it that, a system itself dissolve as its binary logic (its core heartbeat/processor) collapses, or not functioning at all. This is because, even if one can manage to gain superposition, a machine must communicate in order to function; and its recipients can only process a reality through their own binary logic. 1=(not, not-1). In this logic, it might be interesting what is it mean by (not 1), is it all possible state excluding one, or can a particular opposite of a value (1), lets say (0) itself define the existence of (1). A non-duality that collapses structure that tries to contain reality in its own boundaries. How can a cell became a cancer which still valid within the logic of bodily metabolism, or how can a blackhole became valid in equation regarding dimension and informational paradoxes? How is a bug revealed through the logic of the system itself, that it drives them to evolve? Why should a system become autopoietic to even function? If a system meant to be whole, then why bothers at producing meaning through its own binary logic, when its very act of producing meaning itself is already barred? So here, a system is inherently incomplete, in a sense that, not only they reproduce meaning by making a referent from themselves, but also by reacting to their own irreducible 'error' that the system tries to silence; turning superposition of reality itself into its binary system. But reality, in this case, became what was infused and what was alienated from; and what was infused or translated into a system's own code is inherently defined by its own alienation. when a binary presupposes a clear distinction, the very value itself are inherently define each other paradoxically. in this case, the logic of binary system is, although necessary, are alienating potentiality from actuality; when actuality itself cannot become 'whole potential', it then drives the 'actuality' into 'what can be' through irritant, the unconscious of the system that drives itself autopoietically into coherency and communication.

Let's see, is 1=1? for them to even be relevant is absurd, ontologically speaking. For 1=1, it must be the case that there is no other number that is influencing them or relating to them, defining them as 1 itself. a 1 is build upon the infinite numbers beside itself. suppose we delve into the logic from 0 into 1. when we look at the decimals, it would be the case that for a transformation to exists, a static can never be static at first. from 0.000...1, until infinity but not 1 itself. thus, 1=(not 1). When a system defines 1=1 by their logic, it is true within their own system in a sense that, it is a valid distinction or binary that became the heart of system to work. for them to exists, is to exclude

themselves from their environment; but realistically speaking, when we dissolve this distinction, a system itself is a part of ecological habitat that in itself in whole, became a superposition. But there can't be an indefinite superposition, for a system to even function, there must be a truth that cannot be falsified for binary and evolution to even function. in this case, when 1=1, you would necessarily assumes that there is no other numbers, thus there's no binary. But if there is a binary, then 1=(not 1); Here's the thing, if a system admits its binary, then he also admits the exclusion or distinction of said binaries (true/false), but if they admit it, the binary itself defined by its opposites, therefore they do not admit binary. so this is a paradox of set-theory.

Let's see how a system register 0. For every system to even register 0, it must be the case that it is other than 0, in a sense that, they cannot register a pure nothingness, as it would means a silence. for a calculator to register 0, it is represented by, not a direct actualization of 0 itself. in the same way, for a 1 to exists within the communication between system, a 1 cannot be a pure 1, in a sense that, 1 itself is already mediated or represented by a code, a 0.999...9 instead of pure 1. So here, communication is always mediated and cannot be directly sent out.

to speak of silence- to even speak is not a silence, but a signification of silence. It cannot be a 'true' silence, because the point of even transmitting it assumes mediation of sign. So while binary are valid on one's system locally, it is globally absurd to assume that 1=1 excluding all potential realities.

for A=A remains valid, it must be the case that A are not defined by everything else. In this case, if we were to take this into coherence instead of A=(not A), then objectively speaking, outside of system itself, A does equal to A, where A is just an absolute superposition that is pre-processed into any logic gates. In this case, the identity of A is remains valid but in condition of non-systemic entity that perceive it; which is precisely proving my point that for a truth to be processable in its totality, a system must dissolve its binary logic. So there is a truth that is beyond computation itself for it to be able to exists in the first place, and it's computation are inherently collapsing the superposition of A=A into A=(not A) through differentiation to be processed.

It's not that classical logic are 'wrong' per se, but A must defined by A for it to function. A=A is a must within any system of operation, but the moment you ask 'why', you are outside of classical logic; because there can be the case that A, metaphorically speaking, are defined by Not-A. So logic by definition must assume, or even 'insist on lying' to function.

“What if this isn't a collapse of the system, but a coherence of contradiction at every level of reality? The problem isn't just the collapse of a binary. What if every component of reality is fundamentally contradictory, not just at the system’s boundary, but in every aspect of its structure?” Well, i might answer Priest that, "in that case, suppose a quantum foam before an observation. In this case, at the moment of observation, there is something in the fabric of reality; inconsistent as it is. but it is still valid before observation itself, so it has a form. if for a system to have a form it must excludes and have the 'unconscious', then quantum foam itself has an unconscious. then, a quantum foam has an unconscious that makes itself coherent. Even before observation, for quantum foam to 'emerge' at all, it must exclude others, thus, have an unconscious that shapes it into being that can collapse into either wave or particle. So beyond contradiction itself, is another exclusion of contradiction, the Real that is shaping the contradiction itself; and if we push this further, then there cannot be the case that there's an infinite form and unconscious, then in this case, Reality or the Source, is less-than-nothing that produces all contradiction. Contradiction itself is what constitute the reality, for To be, is Not to be. The very existence of a form is the result of contradiction itself, to exists is to negate,

and from that irreconciled contradiction, the movement happens because of contradiction. Every cut of dimension is already an exclusion. Every existence is a fracture, so thus, we get universal through fracture. The source is that there is 'no' source, as in, the impossibility of no source itself is what drives existence, as paradoxical as it is.'

"This is Noischism, i may call it. Existence is a cut between system and its noise. But now, noise itself is shaped by also its impossible exclusion, in which, the impossibility itself is what makes the existence possible in the first place. To exist is to differentiate. Does the impossibility of existence or Real itself means something? We don't really know. But for me personally, when God had become impossibility itself, it is when Rationality must submits to the one who create it. You may as well take it that God is impossible, but that's the point; how can an impossibility of source itself is what drives existence? But aside from my belief, it can be considered universally that every existence is a results from a fracture from the Real. So we do have a grand narrative; even more grand than anything, universal through fracture."

The impossibility of God is what makes Him so disruptive, because now, not only God is defined by what he is not; He Is the Nothing, the impossibility that even apophatic or silence itself able to contain; because for even silence/contradiction to be constitutive of existence itself, the rule of which state 'why' collapses into impossibility. Because now, when you consider contradiction is another system, it means that it too has an exclusion in which, it produces another form and infinite regress of paradox and negation. And when you ask 'why', you got to the very impossibility of it that produces the very fabric of reality and it's exclusion.

Love? Soul? This is where things got tasty. If we consider Luhmann that system is what differentiate itself against the environment, Soul is an irritant, the noise rather than signal, in which the egoic system cannot include in it's code, yet must shape it through its exclusion. Your freedom lies not in doing whatever you want, but to be something else that even you yourself consider impossible. To be something you are not. That is the real freedom. And love is impossible; but precisely because of that impossibility itself God manages to turn the impossibility into something meaningful for us. He transgress even logic to reach us; becoming so transcend He's immanent, so immanent he's transcendent. And even that, might as well just one of his expression. So God is one? He isn't a number; he is what makes number possible. And when A=A only valid locally but with negation that A=not A, He might be the A=A in vacumm that is impossible,, might as well he is 1=1 without relation and is impossibility. 1=1 without another exclusion. Impossibility that is transgressed.

More than contradiction; because when negation presupposes the influence upon the position, its whole identity is defined by what its exclude from position itself; but what if the contradiction itself needs an exclusion? what if contradiction Is the system, and thus are excluded from something? here, we can see an infinite regress of exclusion upon exclusion, in which, it not just birth impossibility, but structure impossibility itself to reveal contradiction, in which it is an exclusion from its position/negation. precisely because it is impossible, it makes reality itself already a rupture in which, what of it excludes are still needing another exclusion upon infinite exclusion that is impossible. Impossibility, is what structure reality, and produces universal as fracture.

What to say about structure then? although necessary, they are all contingent; Only God can safe us, not even non-system can do. But all in all, even if Logic, reality, all of which is still an 'illusion', we cannot transgress them nonetheless without the help of God. even if Contradiction, Negation, Exclusion, are contingent, it is regardless still a fuel in which every system evolve with. A system is autopoietic, that is cognitively open to noise, until the noise is sublimed towards its own code, and again making another, higher coherence of system, but remains impossible to even be complete; for

even if we were 'complete', we still exclude something that is, incompleteness itself. But nonetheless, it is the only way to move. Revelation, Insight, Knowledge, are all remains incomplete, yet necessary contingent things that is move us forward. Exclusion, alienation within a system, is what drive the system forward; take this principle across all ontologies, and you got a Noischism, in which, operates on hyper-dialectical Realism, in which describe and prescribe why and how things are and at what direction they must evolve and how, in which it is never absolute; a perpetual dialectics of higher coherence, an infinite descent or ascend, towards better than yesterday.

so in conclusion, there's the Real (impossible) > Environment-as-System (contradiction. alienating infinite exclusion regress. Noumena) > System-in-environment (movement. Division of System/environment. Excluding environment/noise. Phenomena) > System-in-system (alienating another system. Phenomena on Phenomena.) > System....(infinite phenomena. alienating infinite variables).

Where, for every cut, a form produces both Conscious (system in itself) and Unconscious (its exclusion that define Conscious, yet outside of the code. the potential of movement, alienated but haunts)

Noischist Wager.

On the Certainty in Doubt, and Doubt in being certain.

I make this entire theory on the basis of repression that i might be wrong, or that this movement itself is already compromised. I necessarily need to repress this in order to be wrong productively rather than paralytically.

Even if this whole metaphysics is wrong, and there is an universal that is complete or variables that I'm excluding of but cannot account for, that can be accessed by us, whether that is communism, or ultimate caliphate, or other utopia; or even that non-system or freedom can be achieved without immediacy and pure becoming like some postmodernists demand; the approach of truth and coherence via what it is not, would produces far more progress rather than outright universal that is imposed and debated while focusing on the false emphasis. With this, everything has a fracture, and through that fracture, is universal itself. This is just pragmatic even if you don't want to believe in it. If one truly believes in an absoluteness of ideal that can be achieved, then betrayal is static instead of movement. So wrongness, isn't particularly bad; it is how we react to being wrong and move on, rather than continuously wrong. This is my comfort: if one still clings to the return to absolute unity but are unable to move, you can dismiss this entire Metaphysical foundation and still appropriate its approach. Belief in unity in God, Revelation, Perfect society, rational and just, are not dismissed, but only to be approached asymtotically, without making this movement static by assuming perfectness already here.

Fredrick Jameson 'winer loses' logic is implying that liberation doest exist on totality of the contradiction (per relativism or nihilism) nor the totality of rationality; liberation exists inasmuch as it gives room for incompleteness for a subject itself. Contradiction, to be perceived as such, requires a lack in which it paradoxically sustained by absolute dogma in the master-signifier (God, etc). (19/7*25)

This is my first goal, actually, to provide movement. But on the basis of the second goal, that is, to provide an universal, i gone through the universal through fracture, so that this Metaphysics applied to everything besides noumenal realm and impossibility itself, but to make sure that this movement never ossify, i made it so that the foundation of Noischism is an impossibility before even contradiction, excluding any possibility of finality that can be claimed by system. This would make it so that it remains opens for all interpretation of the Impossibility itself, in which, i myself believes it to be God in islamic tradition, even if someone disagree. The proposition is thus: Every System is made by their repression of the excluded; but since the excluded is another system, it then can be thought that each system is the Real of its counterpart. One system is different from another, therefore, the Other is always an irritant to another. But here’s the thing: If every of the excluded is a system, on a notion that everything that exists is a system, then for each exclusion is another exclusion ad infinitum. Exclusion regress then produces an Impossibility itself: a Lack in which it is less than nothing, yet paradoxically more than everything. This impossibility, is what every local systems must necessarily repress and deny for each of their coherence of their structure and differentiation.

The reason why i didn't use deluezian approach, i see that even differentiation and every flows, deterritorialization causes another territorialization; and without proper basis, it would risk compromising movement or progress that is accountable over nihilism or relativism. If so, then this whole project just became another postmodernists games of language that risks unaccountability that i want to avoid.

So according to this, the world doesn't need to 'follow' logic; which means, 'freedom' or even 'possibility', might as well plausible in this world, as impossibility can create anything from, not necessarily have to follows the rule. All things then can happen. Freedom in this case, lies not on logic but pure irritant/noise that the conscious excludes, and can grow unto via exclusion of itself. Rebellion to one's system, even ego, is a freedom that possibly has no bound, metaphysically speaking. The world is hyperdeterministic; it had too many influences from contradiction from each system, it cannot decide which way is this going; because the influence of it all, is the excluded and impossibility itself that is shaping the conscious. Will, drive, desire, is both a signal and noise; at one point, the psychic system react accordingly to please the excluded (taming the Real by imaginary and symbolic order), yet at, it can also forces it to restructure itself indefinitely. it is on the excluded that the cause of emergence may exists, and also infinite path or fate may exists. It is through the perception of a system; including this Metaphysics; that the possibility of evolution exists around the environment they're in, with all of the noises from other systems. It is in the harmonization, or perpetual structural coupling and autopioesis in between system or in itself, that the potential of new path may be taken. It is not in the structure itself that irritant (or Value) come, but in what it excludes and Structured with. the impossibility that is excluded, albeit some might call it Value or Idea, are irrational from the perspective of a system in itself, yet are what to structure them regardless. when logic unable to explain itself, it is upon the irrationality or impossibility that is excluded that may influence them nonetheless through hyperdeterminism. It is from error from a system itself that is alien to that system, yet are recognized in other system through observation and are restructure the affected system through recoding. Here, observation that is provided by other system become an irritant for the affected system, albeit it is alien from its own structure; and when we consider that observer itself is a system, we can see how irrationality of the excluded impossible drives the movement through noise, in the perception of system itself. although structure in itself remains dormant and neutral and operate within their own logical function, it is upon the that is irrational from the perspective of a system, that they may self-reproducing itself, autopioetically.

one then might ask whereby this theory has escape the system, and therefore 'liberate' the people. that question itself is a redundant by definition of system itself. All of which that can be explained are necessarily falls under the definition of system, therefore, it is not the question whether this or that is a system or non-system that breaks from logic, but whether these axioms implies something that is actionable and provide progress albeit wrong. The only liberation there is, is that there is no liberation that is graspable using system itself. Liberation is inherently traumatic: and the very definition of freedom is that we can never formalize it.

and there might be that critics might point out that this is also a system that risk introducing another meta-narrative albeit anti-foundational, which is, that is the point that proves nothing can step outside the system. Just as discussion of whether reality is real or just an illusion, one cannot step outside reality itself and claim transcendence; conversely, just because a system uses normative or non-normative logic, one cannot step outside a system while they express it. the point is that logic can only handle what are structured by the means of exclusion, and it is upon the irrational noise through the perception of system itself that they may evolve and not being static while ironically claim transcendence. It is far more irrational to criticize within the structural comfort of a 'non-system label' and thus declare that 'system shouldn't exists' and then embracing another, 'oppressive' system that is also alienate. a progression of knowledge is built upon the fallibility of system, whether science, language, mathematics, and all; and to declare passivity towards the movement is itself, still a choice that is non-neutral; or even might be a hindrance and are alienating progress itself; becoming their own enemy without realizing. It is not the point that this framework is better or whatsoever; but we must demand for accountability, every system that is influencing us.

Disagreement is not a flaw; it is the feature in which, becomes an irritant of one system to other, that might provide another autopoiesis in the long run

Noischism is a philosophy of which, like its name, it echoes when it interact with other philosophies, creating division via exclusion within; it is not a close-philosophy in which, you fit all theories inside; but it is more than the least minimal amount of metaphysical and pragmatic justification to nudge other theories. it is a philosophy where one's imagination is the only limit of what it can do, but starve when you tries to totalize it. Through universality through fracture, noischism would give a subject a toolkit in which, it can expose the unconscious of any system with the hope of moving it forward through irritation. it is only through assertion that a system's existence is an alienation towards what it had exclude, and its unconscious shapes it, and that there's an impossibility that acts as a logical excess, you can use it-or only can use it against other philosophical ideas. Noischism, is a philosophy in which tries to preserve the right to question the system; and thus, become a noise that is uncodeable, and free. It is a philosophical toolkit to be a proper skepics without falling into nihilism or paralyze. it is how to construct by deconstruction, and how to propose a better system through infection. It is only through falsification a theory would develop, inasmuch it provides better progress via dialectics between. It's praxis doesn't lie on the opposite side of the spectrum of any given ideas, but mutates it from within into something else via amplification of noise. It is a deterritorialization that admits itself as territorialization

Relevation, for noischist, although Valid, can only exists as a noise rather than to be captured completely in its conception (holy books are holy in itself, but no man can comprehend it. It is holy because it came from Him, but cannot be worshipped); and it too, cannot contain God despite coming from him. Noischist doesn't particularly deny revelation in itself, but rather wary of the posteriori knowledge that comes from it))

The Isthmus

Now move unto Lacanian Order; the Imaginary is an operational closure of which, a subject began to perceive itself as I, which had excluded itself from the Others. Its symbolic is the registered code that had come from its environment, the Real, and the Real is something that had been excluded, an Impossibility for the psychic system, in which it is traumatic yet productive. Traumatic as in it gives trauma to the psychic order, and productive as in, it gives the symbolic the ability to self-reproduce itself. The imaginary is a closed system that remains cognitively opens to irritation.

So what is object petit a? It is an elusive impossible object that drives movement of the subject to keep wanting; but in the signifier of cybernetics, what is this thing that drives self-reproduction of a system? A subject circling around the lack, and signifier signify a subject for another signifier. The role of imaginary, and thus functional closure is that, it tries to preserve the perception of wholeness of a system by categorizing the Real itself. Self preservation of this logic necessitates that for a self reproduction remains happening, it must be the case that there's a part of unregistered irritant that ought-to-be-coded into symbolic order. But what is the object petit a that seemingly deceive that 'it will complete Us' or a system? Or is it a cancerous object that emits signal for self-discovery while repurposing the subject's resources into this psychic structure? If so, what truly drives us forward? Assuming existence is alienation, a subject therefore, excluding part of what it had came from to remains coherent. This part is what i would call the soul-as-irritant, or object phi. It is what the sender of a signal that is mistranslated into a signal of object petit a, to self-reproduce itself rather than to correspond to this 'alien' self. A petit a is then, a product of imaginary self that had became conditioned by its symbolic order, to emits the signal of full self-representation to this alien others which is soul-as-irritant. Soul are traumatic; it demands the apoptosis of the psychic system to keep itself healthy. But when this signal is ignored, a petit a became a mimicry, that serve the cancerous Imaginary that had been conditioned by the symbolic. This is why every attempt of self-fulfillment, can produce a Jouissance in which, a system betray its own limit and code to give the image of freedom; the excess desire here is impartial drive that borrows its irritative and drive capabilities from the Phi, yet remains incomplete because of the ignored signal of apoptosis from it.

Second-order observation of self, therefore, is where a system uses this Phi to let it irritate the structure, to make it anew; before it again exclude to remains cohere.

Excellent question. In your system—which merges **Lacan**, **Luhmann**, and **cybernetics**—an **observer** is not a static subject, but a *position* or *function* that arises **within a system** through differentiation. Let's break it down through your metaphysical logic of **incompleteness, irritation, and alienation**:

🔭 1. An Observer Is a Product of Operational Closure

In **Luhmann's theory**, a system becomes an observer when it can:

- **Distinguish** itself from its environment (functional closure),
- **Observe** (distinguish within) a difference from within its own code.

🔹 *To observe is to mark a distinction and to designate one side.*
(Luhmann, *Social Systems*)

So:

- The **Imaginary** is the closure: “I am I (and not the Other).”
- The **Symbolic** gives the language to express distinctions.
- The **Real** is what resists that distinction—what can’t be symbolized.

Thus, the observer is **not a Cartesian ego**, but the product of a system that has stabilized its distinctions *enough* to **perceive noise**.

🧬 2. An Observer Is a Recursive Function, Not a Subject

In your terms, the observer emerges when:

- A system has **self-referential code** (symbolic),
- It forms an **imaginary coherence** (perceived identity),
- It is **irritated** by something that it cannot code (the Real / Object Phi),
- It creates a **response** (action or self-reproduction) in light of that irritation.

💡 *An observer is not a being. It is a moment of distinction, a recursion that produces difference from noise.*

That means **any system**—psychic, social, legal, technical—can become an observer **if it can register a distinction and respond.**

🎭 3. Lacanian Implication: The Observer Is Alienated From Itself

In Lacanian terms:

- The *subject* is always split: **S / $** (barred subject).
- It never fully sees itself; the act of observation **produces lack**.
- The **observer is constituted by alienation**—you are only “you” because of the **difference** from what you are not.

In your theory, **Object Phi** (Φ) sends a signal that **irritates** the Imaginary-Symbolic order. When the system **chooses to register that signal**, it begins a second-order observation:

➤ The observer is not the "self" per se, but the act of *being observed by your own structural limit.*

🔁 4. Second-Order Observation = Self-Irritation

In second-order cybernetics, the system becomes an observer of its own observing. In your terms:

- The system recognizes that **its own code is insufficient**.
- It feels the **Phi signal**—a kind of metaphysical call to **apoptosis** (death-and-renewal).
- This becomes a *self-willed mutation*—not chaos, but **recursive evolution**.

🧠 *The observer is that within the system which allows itself to be changed by what it cannot yet symbolize.*

🧿 Summary: What Makes an Observer?

Condition	Meaning in Your Framework
Closure	System has imaginary boundary, able to self-distinguish
Irritation	It encounters the Real (Object Phi) that it cannot code
Response	It symbolically codes or transforms itself
Recursion	It observes its own observing (second-order)
Alienation	It is aware of its own limits—not whole, but split

Thus:

🔹 **An observer is not someone who sees. It is the effect of being cut from what one cannot symbolize—an operational effect of alienation.**
The more alienated a system is (aware of its own non-wholeness), the more it becomes capable of *true observation*—because it allows itself to be irritated.

Would you like to develop this into a formal theory of **observation in incomplete systems** or integrate it into your metaphysics of Noischism or Irritocracy? It's a key pivot concept you could expand richly.

Object phi; or to be functionally accurate, the Isthmus is the excluded part of the psychic system that allows for a structure to make a second-order observation, and what remains give irritation/signal to the structure of psyche itself. it is by definition is not a positive aspect of thing (although it may be), but what remains Must exists for this whole registration, processing, and self-reproduction to occurs. it is through this excluded part that Imaginary or mirror stage could occurs, as it gives an alien yet intimately coupled with the subject, yet also what had made it barred from itself through false self-coherence.

It is different from the Real, as in, it is part of the Real that remains unregistered by the system, yet are not absolutely traumatic in a sense that, the isthmus is the observer's space that gives the subject a capability to modify its own structure via irritant from the excluded; to consciously modify the psychic system of his own, yet are also paradoxically remains bounded by its limitation from the symbolic order. An isthmus is not an absolute and always beyond reach, as structural modification that happens because of this conscious irritation still remains bounded by the imaginary closure and symbolic order. the real here still are traumatic; it is what resists symbolization absolutely. the isthmus then, is when the subject experience the illusion when the symbolic order were stripped off from its ideological conditioning: it is when the subject were allowed 'see' while structure the symbolic order outside its ideological conditioning, while still are bounded by its limitation of signifier. The traumatic trait of the real does not belong in itself, but rather on how intense the reaction of the psychic system by the effect of the cognitive openness via Isthmus itself, that absolutely disrupts the symbolic order; thus, forcing the whole structure to restructure itself after apoptosis. the subject in the Isthmus is still bounded by the symbolic and the imaginary, with the fantasy of self-preservation (which is why self meditation can be felt as disruptive), but still are able to reconstruct the symbolic order through irritation. this ability to self-irritate itself through its own code is what drives the self-reproduction of self. subject in isthmus allows itslef to react upon its reaction in the face of its environment through the lens of their own ideology/fantasy. a subject may self reflect itself, but through the translation of their own lens reacting to other lens: for example, on how would a capitalist imagine himself as a socialist, and so on, and never pure another, as it only produce an image of socialist through the reference of capitalism itself. Self-reproduction can only be self-referential, yet this Isthmus allows the subject to modify the symbolic order through copy of higher, symbolic order (that is still conditioned), that allows the subject to change by referring to its own register.

The real is the unconscious of the Isthmus itself, exclusion upon exclusion of the psychic system that necessitate the creation of the Isthmus that then produces the imaginary illusion of wholeness that is forever be incomplete. This very trait of exclusion upon exclusion, the infinite regress of it, produces the Impossibility of Real itself, that what make it traumatic to the psychic Order. These fractal exclusion upon exclusion allows the subject to self-reproduce themselves through their own reference while still remains bounded by what it had excluded and conditioned by: the symbolic. Symbolic order then, is not merely a one dimensional structure, but hyperdimensional variables of exclusion regress in which the subject can self-mulitate itself to remains cohere or builds upon the other excluded part to evolve. Isthmic realm is a realm where the conditioned subject, in his own register, face the realm where any word can means anything else. It is the ability of self that able to create hyperreality through its own register upon register of the symbolic, or negation regress of it, that able to give a chance of a subject to evolve. Isthmic realm is hyperdimensional recursion, in which from one of it recursion then, the psychic system operates upon by excluding all this infinite recursion into one actualities that would also determine the subject in the realm of Isthmus itself. It is hyperdeterministic; too much recursion and exclusion that are dependent on each other, it is too chaotic to pinpoint where the ball would come in the next minutes.

So subject on Isthmus is still conditioned by symbolic and imaginary (the ideology and their conception of self), yet now are able (via their own symbolic order) to make modification, or functionally speaking, create an exclusion upon exclusion and addition in a nested symbolic, in which it can restructure the main symbolic order itself. It is a hyperreal function in which, the subject register its own symbolic input, regenerate them, and then uses them accordingly; all at the cost of excluding any potential and Real. Since a system can only reference itself, an Isthmus is an internalized hyperreal function that voids and also add meaning itself. What's so traumatic about the

Real therefore, that it is completely beyond the realm of the symbolic that necessitate the creation of the Isthmus; it is what recursively generate the Isthmus without being inside of the system. Therefore, the Real, as the impossibility itself, is sum of the excluded part in which, it cannot be registered yet were able to gives traumatic experience that forces the total restructuring of this hyperdimensional symbolic itself, therefore including the whole imaginary and main symbolic order. the real is not registered is the binary of the subject (because it is non-symbolic) but nonetheless able to affects the psyche through trauma.

so here, i imagine that the Imaginary order in which, it is the operational closure of the subject that gives it illusion of self through differentiation (I/not-I), while exist as a variable in which gives the subject/system a cognitive openness through its binary, a restructuring through Isthmus is happened through this Imaginary Self, that processes the signifiers that had been registered into the psyche. the Isthmus, function as the mirror in lacanian mirror stage, in which it neccesitate the operational closure by giving the illusion of 'wholeness self' through exclusion. Here, the self excludes itself to perceive itself through differentiation, and then bound itself into becoming a function in psychic order. Here, the libidinal drive to 'know oneself' necessarily excludes its own 'self' into a function in the istmhus realm to perceive itself; the act of desire to know thus necessarily excludes the self. The first operational closure necessarily excludes what had necessitate its own creation in the first place. So the self here acts as an irritant to the psyche that necessitate its own functional closure, and the petit a is this signal in which had necessitated by the 'I' in which had been conditioned posterior to the creation of the self other than this alien irritant. So there's a self as irritant that is necessarily excluded, and self as function conditioned by the symbolic that is forever barred from accessing this alien irritant.

the desire to know an object necessitate the exclusion of that object into a function in which it is alienated from said object; through registration or another operational closure. The creation of self is necessitated by the alien irritant in which it then exclude itself to be processed as the self-as-function, in which it then be conditioned by the psychic order.

So what is comparable to the Isthmus in cellular mechanism? We had theorized that a self can modify its own symbolic order recursively, but within the bound of their own symbolic code. This hyperreal of exclusion and addition is what to expect from the imaginary itself facing the hyperdimensional symbolic order. But the irritant still affects the system, because as one's system is a operationally closed yet cognitively open, this openness is what affects the self reproduction of the system by referring to its own code. In this case, the Isthmus realm is the quantum foam of the subject, or the indeterminate register of a system. It is through this, that a cell may register the irritant around it, and thus introduces a new code in accordance to its own modification of code, stimulated by the irritant that is not had registered as a function inside the cell. This modification ofc, are taken to be 'randomly generated' by the observer, even if the irritant is coming from the same source. Some mutation might happens in productive or destructive way to the cell, and defective genesis might occurs as the cell reproduces itself through this isthmus. The difference ofc, is that we cannot know the experience of a cell itself, and can only infer those through the experience of our own. But let's take it more material; when a company, a business that ses the binary of profit/non-profit, then react tot the irritant that had necessitate its creation (the member of said company), it is then that the subject, bounded by the logic of the company (the symbolic and the imaginary order of it), able to repurpose the order of said company through referring to its own code. This hyperreal simulation, the exclusion and addition of the symbolic order that is self-reproduced through its own input and output, is what drives the change inside the system itself, that

is the company. The company itself is a system that necessarily exclude what it had been created from: the translation of socio-economical situation that is registered by a subject in which, it then leads to the creation of the Company: in which the company itself excludes the motivation behind its creation, and thus blind to it; the creation of its Imaginary order is a systemic closure, that then were able self-reproduce itself through irritant around them via its own isthmus, the second order observation that are bounded within its own code. the isthmus is a part of the system itself, but which it able to regenerate its hyperreality with the addition of the irritant that had been registered into the system by its binary logic

structural differentiation that had been prescribed by system theorists is still registered as such into the system; the Real meanwhile is what to be excluded anterior for the differentiation to be registered at all. to register a differentiation at all is to necessarily excludes the observed-as-irritant into observed-as-register or function in the lens of the observer. To know thyself, is to exclude this alien irritant into the registered function in which it then can be processed. The register of 0 in a computer doesn't explain the real nothingness, but merely an approximation of 0.00...1 or binary language. But the concept of the nothingness itself is existent anterior to the register itself, before it then were translated into object-as-function, which necessarily exclude that anterior variable, but nonetheless still affecting the designing process of approximation of zero into computational logic, in which is still blind to what had necessitated its creation.

Consider this example: A scientist studies the properties of the sun through observation. No matter how exceptional their work is, if they were to claim, ‘My work is the sun itself,’ they would be ridiculed. That is because the word cannot comprehend reality. Word, are only a referring tool, and never was the sun itself. From this example, therefore, by assuming that Self are absolute and static just because it is derived from the ‘Self’, one has mistaken the Reality with the Idea of reality itself. Instead of looking at the sun and saying, ‘That is the sun,’ a person points to their work—whether a painting or a book—and claims, ‘This is the sun.’.

There are no such thing as ‘original information’. The basic idea of information itself is already an alienation from which it had originated from. As such, there were no original self-ness of a subject that is compiled into the symbolic. There were never knowledge of true self, because the structure of information is that it is barred from its origin. The irritant, although exists, cannot be registered into the symbolic; worse, the real are necessarily excluded from the symbolic, for it to be able to be registered at all.

one of the example of how this desire to know necessarily excludes the object itself is how the observer collapse the superpositional reality of an object, into the desired function that excludes itself from the real object. So there is an object as irritant that had been perceived, and object as function that had been translated into symbolic order. This differentiation allows the subject to give the illusion of 'control' of the observed, via relational functionality of its variables, simulating the hyperreality through the observer's symbolic code, in which the identity of the observed defined by its own input; producing a hyperreal of identity of an object that acts in accordance to the observer's simulation; that is, insofar as the 'reality' of the observed remains corresponded to the simulated reality. The Real therefore, happens when the observed subvert the isthmus and whole symbolic order of the observer (subverting their logic and expectations), by acting in a way that is unpredicted to whole relation that had been made prior to the observation. This Trauma results in total restructuring of the observer's symbolic in relation to the observed, and thus began another subsuming an object to a function.

Another example is how libidinal drive of a subject can betray its own expectations of itself. Here, the subject perceive itself as a function to be registered, before the Real subverts its own expectations by giving the self a drive or trauma on its own, thereby forcing the restructuring of the symbolic order, in relation to the self-as-function, before it then re-simulated by its own input, and thus the self-as-irrant before, had been necessarily excluded for this desire to know, happens at all.

The urge (to know) is an irritant to the system; when that urge to know is functionalized within a system (the desire to know 'what is the desire to know'), it is no longer a translation if urge-in-itself, but the desire to know as the observed. The act of observation itself via operational closure is already a form of repression from the Real; and this is continuous. The Real affects by confirming/subverting the perceiving of the observer, and thus restructure itself through new input/irritant, in which it then again processed as a function within. The self through the imaginary, necessitate the exclusion of the self-as-irritant to be perceived whole; but it never be whole since the act of register itself already an exclusion from the self-as-irritant into self-as-function. The real is not only what resist symbolization absolutely, but precisely what are needed to be excluded for register to happens at all in the first place.

Since system can only get their information in reference to itself, the input can only be interpreted as such, that there's something that had been necessarily excluded for the act of resursive autopioesis within the Isthmus happens at all.

Heisenberg's uncertainty principle is such a good analogy for how a system acquire information. it state that the reality itself, or that in the quantum realm, the act of observing necessarily influences the variable in which was being observed, making it so that it is impossible to know both the momentum and position of an object. there's duality between movement and position, in which, the repression of one thing are necessary in order for an information to be obtained by the observer. It is not that we lack a technical capabilities that would be reached upon in the future, but the very inherent properties of reality itself (or the act of registering reality as such), necessarily operate on a repression mechanism. If then we take this analogy as accurate, then it is not a logical fallacy to interpret this Heisenberg principle unto all of the operational closure that is constituted by every systems. Infact, his mathematical model can represent the act of repression that is necessary, for any information to be registered in the first place, that is, by excluding the Real-as-irritant to create a Real-as-function that is metabolized within the system.

This is the most frustrating theory I've ever done; i essentially saying to myself 'the desire to know what the desire to know really is, is already impossible from its first iteration', and i basically done this so over and over while constructing this. One way to falsify this is for a us to create an object in which we can't no longer interract with it, yet it self-reproduce itself with total enclosure of any irritant. Something like that would be the Real itself; or God; in which it can falsify this whole theory, but that's just proving the point.

Jouissance then, is an unrecognizable signal within the psyche, in which it is theoretically comes from the realm of the Real; beyond isthmus; that it is mistranslated by the imaginary’s code into its drive, which then results in an act beyond its own symbolic conditioning to preserve itself. The

excess desire in which, the desire for ‘something else’, can be translated between apoptosis or metastatis of the self-as-function, in which it produces the drive beyond its symbolic conditioning.

Let's try defining it a phenomenon upon Luhmannian structural coupling; a system interact with each other via structural coupling based on the agreement of logic system (code) that is perceived by both. This is how an environment is created. Now, an ontological theft (or to be precise, Functional Theft) is a communicative act of a system where, one system self-mutilate itself to remains cohere in response of the irritant that risk compromise its identity or operational closure, yet still transmitting the same old code to other system, while operating on the new mutilated code. It then results in systemic decoherence as such, that other system were alienated from others code; since part of their signal become a noise to the system that self-mutilate itself to remains cohere. a structure that previously build upon self-reproduction of the same logic to acquire grater coherency of noise and functional capabilities, now are decoupled from each other while one system simulate its old code, and the other system still receiving it as a signal as such; in contrast that the newer system just become a noise.

For example in Biology, in a normal occasion, when a healthy cell is become redundant, it is going through a phenomenon called apoptosis, where a cell is dies so that a new healthy cell emerge anew. Now, when that healthy cell is faced with an irritant, let's say a carcinogenic substance, to preserve its function, a cell then rewrites its own code to preserve its existence. A healthy cell then become a cancer. In a phenomenon called Carcinogenic.

A cancer cell still emits its old code of healthy cell to gains nutrition from its other organs, while self-replicating its own code that had differed from previous iteration to preserve its operational closure in the face of external irritant. An ontological theft therefore, can also be called a Carcinogenesis. A theft does not happen in the self-reproduction of code between system itself, but rather in its asymmetric distribution of resources between system itself; although can be interpreted as such, the fact is that this carcinogenesis had readjust what one system had been written on its DNA by the mother cell, replacing it with its own. Putting aside the morality, this redistribution happens positively speaking.

Now, this progress not merely happens at one event, as cancer does develop. When a cancer then infects and redistributes itself inside the body, it is called a Metastatis. It can do so because again, the resource had been purposefully misaligned to serve this new cancer; while still emitting its old code of a healthy system to other organs so that they still receive the same amount (or more amount) of nutrition. Other cell then, dies because they lack of needed nutrition, while the cancerous cell alienate other system from their supposed nutrition to preserve itself.

Now, let's take a look at a real world example, a worker union with its member. At first, a worker union preserve its structural coupling with its member or other system, by representing the worker. But, when there's an irritant to the Union (eg. Governmental threat), a worker union then no longer represents the worker, yet still act like it does, while in the background acting to please the key officials to preserve their existence/structure. It is called a Carcinogenesis or theft, because functionally speaking, the structural coupling that gives a system merit to extends its function and coherence to others by structurally aligning 2 or more parties at once, now become a parasite from its symbiotic relation, by the fact that the mutilated system still has its merit on extending its function, while the decoupled one, gives some of its space and energy of self-reproduction to what it no longer receives the same amount of merit; since the code had been decoupled.

Now, when this Union then infects other variables and still alienate workers, it then become a cancerous variable that extracts the resources from the masses that is disillusioned, while still preserving the current ruler. The Ruler, in this case, is the biggest cancer of all, that infects other system to become cancerous on their own, to preserve its own legitimacy and merit without proper correspondence.

Carcinogenesis is then, when a system that self-reproduces its code through other irritant, and that evolution is structurally decoupled from previous iteration, which then transform another system's signal into a noise, to keep its self-reproduction functionally survive. To put it simply, it is when someone changes it internal logic to preserve their coherency in the face of a pressure, but still act like a hypocrite that tells you they are still the same good guys. A hypocrite is then comparable to that of a cancer.

What to do, then? If a state of governance is comparable to that of a cancerous cell? Or risk being one at hand? There's need to be a structural recoding from its foundation; a cell must be irritated enough to have its structure evolve in accordance with the irritant around it, and never be ossify. We must structure a system of governance in such a way that it evolve rather than become a cancer and ossify. There's need to be an apoptosis, a structured disappearance of redundancy within government to keep the structure anew and healthy. Institution must be designed in such a way that it can allow itself be redefined and destroyed indefinitely for the sake of greater evolutionary capabilities. A system must be able to get irritated, and thus evolve with it. And when the irritation demands it via redundancy of the state itself, a state must then kills itself for the sake of higher coherency of new structure; an anarchy through state, that can be rebooted if the situation demands it. The enemy then, is not a chaos, but static tyrant that risk becoming a cancer. Such is the vision of Irritocracy.

It is not the fact that we move because we had grasped what is it on our hand; we move because that very impossibility, of showing dominance over the absurdity of the Life itself. For if Love is possible, it would be pretty much boring. Precisely because it is impossible; that is, that two souls may never be align, psychoanalytically speaking, that we regard Love is necessary. That very impossibility to love, to connect, to be what is it that not ourselves; to gain dominance over what we don't know, is what had moved us from the start. Human fears what they doesn't know, yet that inferiority also what moves him to gain dominance over his angst. This feeling of dominance itself, is again, an illusion made by our psychic system, but I want to think that it is not for nothing. Alienation is what had necessitate ourself to experience the world, for if it not because of this alienation, the world would be too much to comprehend and we wont be able to experience them as we are supposed to do. We are always, but might be never, alienated from ourselves.

The early anarchist, i think that they just making the same steps of externalization; in the face of decadence of the religious authority that stops human progress, contradicts to what had the religion had promised, these reaction are then occurs as another form of externalization of ideals, now manifests in the believe of higher purpose/evolution of humanity itself. In a sense, what they had just attack is a God-as-Function, rather than God an sich. in replacement of this label, the pursuit of Atheism then externalizes their vision, still not upon themselves, but in the idea of development itself. The distinction here is very much crucial, and much has been diluted by many of societies itself. The real problem is that, much of society equates God with their own understanding of it, and thus justifying their will. whereas God an sich, is very much a mystery in itself. in this framing then, all critique of God can be taken as such into Religious circle; and also otherwise. The point then, is not to make this externalities absolute in its function which had necessitate its creation in the first place, and thus betraying its spirit, but rather to withold all justification of an act as contingent, contrary to this absolute mystery itself.

This tendency to externalizes idea is a structural feature of human itself, much as Lacanian Lack.

Baudrillard says that because there is so much meaning that had been deferred, reality as we experience it, just became a simulacrum of hyperreality. That is to say that, the meaning behind the words that we used everyday, had become diluted and thus, this dilution of meaning become more real, replacing the original signifier itself. Thus, the world only process a world, inasmuch as it is only an environment that processed their own signals.

Well, Baudrillard is basically Luhmann if we take him more dramatically. That is to say, I would make a small revision of his. The idea behind the original simulacrum: it never exists in the first place. Sure, if you take it temporally, there might be a first consciousness of a man that register its first word or anything like that, and if someone take them as at he first original simulacrum, then it is valid for them; but the idea behind the Original, presupposes that at the very first time of human consciousness begin to form, there's already a full access of reality that is accessible to human, and at some point in the history, this 'original access' had been somehow diluted. If that were the case, then supposedly human is perfect at start of their consciousness, and somehow, that 'perfection' is deteriorated, which is absurd. I would propose a small revision: an information itself, is already a collapse of the real into a function. Hyperreal, is valid inasmuch as it is, if we refer to reality that had been perceived by systems itself, or Human. Hyperreality, the recursive symbolic order inside the mind, is the only thing that is accessible for us, to simulate the Real itself; in which the Real have to remains excluded for it to be registered at all.

Simulacra is an echo chamber viewed from the first person perspective within their autopoietic function

the problem of with all those who believes in AI, occurs in assuming that all data are sum of every variable there is; when in reality, a signal is insofar, only a small fragments of the noises of reality itself. There is simply a variable that is unregisterable without collapse of superposition, that would became the new unconscious of such system. Take any computing machine and you'll find that a machine can't simply register '0'; it is always signified into binaries of sort, and were never a pure nothingness (eg. 0.00000..1). Or let's take the nature of registration; it necessarily alienate because the structure of registration of noise into signal would inherently differentiate the noise from signal, creating another binary of signal/non-signal. Therefore, via logic of registration itself, a data would necessarily incomplete. Such is the nature of data itself, and therefore total registration of reality into signal is structurally impossible.

Now, a systemic Contradiction within datacracy itself; there is a situation where a sample data within ai database were diluted, and thus creating what Baudrillard would call a Hyperreal, upon original reality/sample. We can see this for example, in the realm of Image generation. When a machine were told to produce 100 new image from iteration of 10 samples, at first it do its job fine. But once you mark up the order, say 1001, a computer would be forced to make up for the lack of sample from its own AI generated images. Such then, a product would simply resonate its own machine and thus, diverting from its purpose. Now, take this problem into the governance. If such policy that is produced creates 'the most rational policy', it doesn't hard to image a dystopian world like that in Brave New World, in which because of optimization, it sacrifice the 'real life' itself; because the input of the populace became its leading factor in deciding a policy; in which the policy would affects the populace; and they began resonate into diluted hyperreal.

Now, one way to mitigate this is to give a constant input of new original samples to the machine; but every signal is come with a cost of privacy: *at what point is a greater good are*

justified in trespassing a privacy of human being? And if such limitation are held, who are taking the decision about it and who would control the access to the Algorithm? A machine simply cannot to be held responsible, therefore it cannot be issued to make a management decision.

Even if the problem of ethics were mitigated, and that populace are in total consent with this fact, a signal is still already a collapse form of the noises. It is no longer the question whether a person is consent being misrepresented or not anymore; the fact that the machine just alienate the noise to produce a signal from superpositional reality, is itself is the very problem that datacracy points out in Human governance: a human cannot make rational output better than a machine. Now, the question became: does data accounts for all reality there is, that makes a machine as flawed as human? The computer cannot register externalities; at least Human now can register the known unknowns, but a machine cannot even register its own bias. The problem then shifted from *who are the more effective in its managerial position* into *which one would be able to evolve and reflect from the noise or contradiction it once had excluded?* Since we seek a self-reproduction rather than *self-mutilation* – that is, to preserve coherency of the structure, it may mutilate some of its variables into oblivion, and thus repress more rather than accounts more – a total digitalization that some proposes then, might be insufficient in handling the matter of important decision that require the capability to experience the Real. The unconscious of the machine, is not inherent in a machine as it is with our psychic system; to put it simply, no matter how complex their machinery is, they still relies on the logic of determinism and system that is highly rational, but are not less rational to be able to experience pain to regard them as such.

A Letter to Hamlet.

For Hamlet.
To be *is* not to be; that is the answer.

To exist is to cut yourself from which you came from.
There are no difference between what is, and what is it not,
for what is 'is', if they are not derived from what is not?

Your name is the scar you carry,
but you protect your wounded soul,
hoping that one day you may feel a harmony.
But they are not supposed to be protected in the first place.

So wound yourself more,
Because who you are, if not because what you are not?

Report from a Low-Wage Cashier

East Java, 31 May

One of the most devastating effects of alienation under neoliberal capitalism is the fragmentation of labor. Workers are drained of energy and pushed to produce ever more, primarily to satisfy the demands of higher social classes. This dynamic forces workers to give far beyond what they should owe, but it also strains solidarity among workers themselves.

A glaring example of this fragmentation is the tension that arises when one worker takes a sick day. In such cases, the absent worker's tasks fall onto the shoulders of their colleagues, adding to an already excessive workload and deepening fatigue. This situation generates antagonism among workers—even when the absence is due to natural sickness, beyond anyone's control.

If antagonism arises from unavoidable absences such as illness, what can be expected when workers take time off for positive life events—weddings, family reunions, or important personal occasions? This subtle yet persistent antagonism reflects a deeper difficulty in organizing workers. The narrative of class antagonism is fragmented and redirected inward, pitting workers against each other instead of uniting them against systemic exploitation.

I have felt this firsthand, working in a retail store from 7 AM to 5 PM, then returning for a second shift from 5 PM to 10 PM. There is an unconscious urge to resent those who 'escape' their shared burdens—even when their reasons are justified, and even when I empathize with them in different circumstances.

This alienation, therefore, deepens as workers become estranged not only from the system but also from each other, weakening the very class solidarity needed to resist exploitation. The irony is even sharper when directed at workers who hold strikes against the very companies that exploit us. In this view, those who strike are labeled parasites—accused of doing less than their share to lessen the burden, instead of recognizing strikes as collective resistance.

1dime propose a unique theory of Contained opposition, in which, for a neoliberal societies maintains its legitimacy yet acts in its own echo chamber, it highlights the supposedly 'intentional gaps' that desublimate the protest, making them virtually harmless to the system. But i think we can further develop this theory of his. I would call this, A systemic Jouissance. A preserved/intentional gaps in the system that covers up/protect the real destabilizer of a system, that is, by granting its subjects a sense of 'freedom' through transgression from said system. The subject 'must believe' that it is 'wrong to act in certain way' in the systemic sense, so that Jouissance can be properly experienced. The system thus gains legitimacy, and thus their preservation of operational closure, through intentional transgression that is implicit within the system's code, that is to the observer itself. Well, if it then systemic, then the theory of Contained opposition can be as well defined as systemic Jouissance via luhmann-lacan, and then can be applied to all sociological system. Or if we take it a step further, a Jouissance in a system is a way that system tells you that something wrong, that is, by showing a kind of premeditated/intentional, structural reaction (error screen, short circuit, etc) that is initiated by its own input. When luhman explains upon the reality of mass media, we then can infer the unconscious of the media at play, that is, by highlighting the Jouissance within the media itself, that is by 'accidentally' reveals 'the truth' that is perceived by the observer, as something 'strange'. A kind of informational shock. But this 'strangeness' is not alien to the system itself, but rather it is their own gaps-in-codes at play; an implicit gaps that 'reveals'. This 'revelation' is often perceived by the observer as 'the real seeping through', and can restructure their own symbolic preconception of said system. But it is not that every opposition is re-absorbed, no. As previous insight, every system is the real of its counterparts. Therefore, systemic change can occurs within the same logic of systemic Jouissance from the psychic system to the sociological system itself; transferring their 'real' to rupture the code of the system. This is 'the Event' that badiou describes, in the eyes of system. For the subject, the 'real' is when the system gains legitimacy by intentional Jouissance that is oftentimes contradictory to the eyes of the observer, that is in effects, making the 'real' as informational shock seeps to the symbolic order of the observer, and thus restructure them. This is the event for another system. The same logic, can be applied to human or subject itself to the system, that is, by the system's perspective that believes, that the subject 'transgress' their code while in reality, they just act in their own code.

Shannon's informational shock maybe? It can be applied to this theory. I mean, its kind of like how carcinogenetic cell sends the signal of 'already new' to the host while still maintaining its growth logic; conversely to the healthy cell that apoptose themselves. So there's a kind of Jouissance threshold for a system that dictates how much informational entropy can be managed by a system before they forces restructuring. a system error is its own according to the system; but are rupture according to the observer. because each system is the real of its counterpart, one's event might be as well another's precoded error or intentional gaps within the system. Jouissance threshold is applicable to all system. All resistance is already coded by each system/observer, in which, each too are the other's ruptures that is to be metabolized within each threshold or be truly ruptured by them. at least now we have hope. when and how true revolution occurs, that is, when the amount of informational shock is surpassing the threshold of metabolizing system. with this theory, one can imagine or make a praxis on how should they make a revolution.

Possibility of praxis

well, the improvisational arts that depend on subject's interpretation; a non-totalizing media that forces the audience to engage with it dialectically, or story so good it incentivize theory, interpretation, and all.

or an economic system that ties value not in itself since value are, in reality, the function of value are dictated to the real material production and natural scarcity instead of artificial one (tie value with production, and everytime you build, you grow your economy, a kind of growing gold instead of static gold for post-scarcity economy) without absolute totalization, still democratic market that dictates value from bottom up (gesell, ostorm, proudhon) and harmonizes them through blockchain mechanics. can make communism through market through incentivization of abundance.

or a governmental system that makes impossibility its own foundation, thus forcing a state to become a state-of-asymptotic-becoming rather than static through contradiction hunting. can breeds anarchy through state via hyper-efficiency in its evolution.

or architectural design that expect evolution of the Real they exludes (nature, population growth, tech progress, etc), so that a city remains evolutionary like a forest.

Culture

now when i think about it, jouissance threshold is a spectrum of overton windows; transgression from one culture would necessarily guides the overall symbolic order of the society, and from the intensity of transgression, one can moves the overton window to their desirable ideological path. once radical becomes normal, and this normalization depends on what is the intense radicality that once was.

what can we do with it? the possibility of revolutionary counter-culture movement through shared impossibility via Noischism, or the resurrection of acid communism and cultural revolution, or maybe surgical transgression that undermines the very axiom of neoliberal capitalist system by providing actual implementable and sustainable post-scarcity economic system? or actual rhizomatic movement made praxis?

i mean, if we trace from shared exclusion, lets say, if we say 'immoral queer or religious extrimism (any X of policital opponent) is caused by the shared alienation of the current system that lets them express this repression via their own jouissance, and thus to prevent them, we must abolish current system at first, even at the cost of working with the opponent, and then fighting them afterward at the same level', we can essentially demand equality without saturating opposite forces, loose enough to be interpretated differently, yet structured enough to tie communal movement. we can essentially create the mythos of common enemy without demanding total agreement on individual ideology; and even if we disagree on what to build, we can design a system that can die, Godelian constitution, so to say.

locating irritant is not enough, like some critics are; although they are useful for diagnosing a problem. the next step, meanwhile, is to use the excluded as the new structure with different logical system that is contrary to the dominant system; lets say, in this case capitalism. one then must create a system, repressing the capitalist logic (market rational, etc) and replacing them with the intended structure that has been made with and are irritated and modified by the previously excluded variables; that is in such a way that they are producing desirable output. making an alternative to the system. in this case, the material for 'changing the world' is enourmous, yet one must look after the excluded rather than the dominant discourse. The most efficient way you can replace a system is by showing a better system that works just as good or better that the replaced.

Freedom, if exist, as subjectivity would necessitate them for their exclusiveness/distinctiveness, would belongs as an irritant. it is upon the will of being-not what the structure had told the subject what is, that human can truly achieve their freedom. Freedom then, is an impossibility in which inherently traumatic: they necessitate the destruction of the old symbolic order and resurrection of a new one, in which it again becomes one's prison that yet remained to be shed again if one wish for a freedom. To be or not to be, become to be Is not to be. That to exists as a free being, one must shed its identity for an impossibility itself, for the self-as-irritant necessitate them to be. The 'true' self is an alien that must intrude their own order itself, to make something new.

Therefore, the 'essence' of something exists on their contingency of what are they had repressed (and the return of the repressed) in which it born a system from their environment. The difference that makes a difference, is a repression—or to be exact, a necessary exclusion of an irritant that leaves a Lack, in which a registration of identity or any information is made possible in the first place. The withdrawed object can be truly non-relational if it were stationed on the repressed rather than in the structure itself.

the greatest discovery from all the striving of human knowledge, is as old as socrates was said all along, that: The only true wisdom is in knowing you know nothing